

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6, 10 and 12-15 remain pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-6, 10 and 12-15 are rejected. Claims 2, 7-9 and 11 are previously cancelled. Claims 1 and 10 are amended herein to clarify the invention.

Applicant herein traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection of the claims cited in the above-referenced Office Action.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 15 are rejected as obvious over Walker et al. under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection. For a rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) to be sustained, the differences between the features of the combined references and the present invention must be obvious to one skilled in the art.

In accordance with the claimed features of independent claims 1 and 10, the goods supply system provides the second selling program to the sale processing system, for realizing the second process of selecting and buying the item (hereinafter “the second selling process”) different from the first process of selecting and buying the item (hereinafter “the first selling process”). The sale processing system provides, to the user terminal, the second selling program to be carried out. The goods supply system can be managed by a goods supplier, and the second selling program can be described to realize the goods supplier's preferable selling process as the second selling process. In this case, the goods supplier can sell easily his/her goods by his/her preferable selling process thorough the Web site managed by the

sale processing system. Moreover, as it is only necessary for the sale processing system to provide the selling program to the user's terminal, for example, even when a new goods supplier joins in the Web site, the sale processing system is not required to do something special for the new supplier, for example, creating a page special for the new supplier.

Walker et al., in comparison, only discloses a sale processing system in accordance with which, by using a product data base (FIG.4), an available product and its price are associated with each other. An appropriate product is selected from the product data base based on the credit value of the gift certificate. Although Walker discloses that the product can be selected by a redeemer in a "game-like" process (col.10 lines 21- 23), Walker does not teach or suggest a construction by which selling processes vary from product to product, and the reference is silent about a goods supply system. Accordingly, the manner by which the selling processes might vary from product to product is, at best, unclear. All that can be derived from Walker et al. is that a product data base with which the product, its price and its selling process are associated with each other is prepared in advance. It is impossible to derive from Walker et al. the provision that the second selling program, thereby to be executed on the user's terminal for realizing the second selling process, is provided to the sale processing system from the goods supply system.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited reference(s) for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 10, 12, 13 and 15 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

Claims 5 and 14 are rejected as obvious over Walker et al. in view of Satchell et al. (US 5,822,216) under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). The applicant herein respectfully traverses this rejection.

Satchell et al., like the Walker et al. reference, fails to teach or suggest the construction that the second selling program, to be executed on the user's terminal for realizing the second selling process, is provided to the sale processing system from the goods supply system managed by a supplier. Thus, the combination of prior art references fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations as properly required for establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the rejected claims are not obvious in view of the cited references for the reasons stated above. Reconsideration of the rejections of claims 5 and 14 and their allowance are respectfully requested.

No fee is believed due. If there is any fee due the USPTO is hereby authorized to charge such fee to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form
for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By Frank J. Jordan
Frank J. Jordan
Reg. No. 20,456
Attorney for Applicant
and,

By Lawrence Wechsler
Lawrence Wechsler
Reg. No. 36,049
Attorney for Applicant

Jordan and Hamburg LLP
122 East 42nd Street
New York, New York 10168
(212) 986-2340